

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

September 13, 2021

Meena Seshamani, M.D., Ph.D.
Deputy Administrator and Director of the Center for Medicare
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Department of Health and Human Services
7500 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850

Re: CY 2022 Payment Policies under the Physician Fee Schedule

Dear Deputy Administrator Seshamani:

We write regarding the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services' (CMS) 2022 Physician Fee Schedule (PFS) proposed rule, released on July 13, 2021, which cuts critical services under the PFS by up to 20 percent and exemplifies the need for fundamental PFS reform relating to the PFS “budget-neutrality” provision. The primary driver of drastic cuts to PFS providers under the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule, the “budget-neutrality” provision also was the driver of massive cuts in the 2021 PFS Final Rule.¹ These year-over-year “budget-neutral” cuts, being implemented during a pandemic, are causing significant disruption to the healthcare system and are being implemented without regarding to patient outcomes, actual PFS provider resource needs, or any other rationale policy.

While some characterize the PFS “budget-neutrality” provision as a “sometimes you win, sometimes you lose” policy, in fact, over the last decade, cumulative PFS redistributions clearly have negatively impact certain providers. For example, cardiology, vascular surgery, radiation oncology, and radiology have endured cumulative cuts over the last decade in the PFS of between 20 and 40 percent.² Other times, the PFS “budget-neutrality” provision is characterized as rebalancing the PFS away from higher-paid providers and towards lower paid providers. In fact, however, in the 2021 PFS, the lowest paid providers — physical therapists — received a 9 percent cut which was redistributed to other PFS providers making at least 170 percent more.³⁴ Indeed, given the strong correlation between ongoing cuts and reimbursement volatility for PFS providers vis-à-vis the health system consolidation trend, we believe the best characterization of the so-called PFS “budget neutrality” provision is that it is a driver of PFS center closures and *increased* costs to the Medicare program.

While President Biden’s *Executive Order on Promoting Competition in the American Economy* makes it clear that this Administration is concerned with health system consolidation, the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule serves to undercut this initiative. According to the American Medical

¹ The significant provider cuts in the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule are compounded by the 2021 PFS Final Rule cuts, which, as a result of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 are being phased-in with a 3.75% overall PFS reduction slated for January 1, 2022, and another conversion factor cut of a similar magnitude slated for January 1, 2024.

² Health Management Associates, *Analysis of the 2022 Physician Fee Schedule*, 2021

³ Urban Institute and SullivanCotter, *Analysis of Physician Compensation*, January 2019.

⁴ Bureau of Labor Statistics, *U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook, Physical Therapists*. 2021

Association, the share of physicians working for a hospital increased from 29.0 percent in 2012 to 39.8 percent in 2020.⁵ The ongoing pandemic also has accelerated these trends with hospitals and corporate entities acquiring 20,900 additional physician practices over the last two years.⁶ Given that the reimbursement for all specialists is, on average, more than \$100,000 in a vertically integrated health system than in a physician office, the incentive is clear for beleaguered **PFS providers who may no longer be able to sustain cuts in the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule to simply close their centers and continue the migration to large health systems.**⁷

While the 2021 PFS budget-neutrality effect was due to the CMS policy of putting more money into evaluation and management (E/M) services, the main driver of provider cuts in the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule relates to budget-neutrality effects of a CMS proposal to update clinical labor data. Like last year’s E/M proposal, on its face, updating clinical labor data in the CMS database makes sense. However, because of aforementioned PFS “budget-neutrality,” the incorporation of new clinical labor data actually results in **massive cuts of up to 20 percent to critical services in the PFS.**⁸ These impacts also will have profoundly negative effects on health equity. While President Biden’s FY 2022 Budget contained many worthy provisions aimed at addressing health inequity through the elimination of disparities in health care, the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule actually threatens to undermine these initiatives in areas throughout the PFS as exemplified with several examples in the table below.

Disease/Service	Health Inequity	2022 PFS
Venous Ulcer / Endovenous radiofrequency ablation	Black patients present with more advanced venous insufficiency than White patients ⁹	Key Code (36475) Cut by 23%
ERSD / Dialysis Vascular Access	Black and Latino patients start dialysis with a fistula less frequently despite being younger ¹⁰	Key Code (36902) Cut by 18%
Cancer / Radiation oncology	Black men are 111 percent more likely to die of prostate cancer; Black women are 39 percent more likely to die of breast cancer ¹¹	Key Code (G6015) Cut by 15%
Peripheral Artery Disease / Revascularization	Black Medicare beneficiaries are three times more likely to receive an amputation ¹² Latino are twice as likely ¹³	Key Codes (37225-37221) Cut by 22%

⁵ American Medical Association, *Recent Changes in Physician Practice Arrangements: Private Practice Dropped to Less Than 50 Percent of Physicians in 2020*, Carol K. Kane, PhD, June 2021

⁶ Avalere, *Hospitals and Corporations Own Nearly Half of U.S. Physician Practices: Covid-19 Accelerated Ownership Trend*, June 2021

⁷ Post, Brady PhD et al., *Hospital physician integration and Medicare’s site-based outpatient payments*, Health Serv Res. 2021;56:7 15

⁸ It is worth noting another area ripe for reform is the PFS “impact table,” which does not disaggregate specialty impact by site-of-service nor include the 3.75% cut to the conversion factor, thereby masking the true impact of the PFS on office-based specialists in the 2022 PFS Proposed Rule.

⁹ Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, *Advanced Chronic Venous Insufficiency: Does Race Matter?*, 26 December 2016

¹⁰ *Racial/Ethnic Disparities Associated With Initial Hemodialysis Access*. JAMA Surg.2015 Jun;150(6):529-36. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2015.0287

¹¹ Cure, *Cancer Sees Color: Investigating Racial Disparities in Cancer Care*, Katherine Malmo, 16 February 2021

¹² Dartmouth Atlas, *Variation in the Care of Surgical Conditions: Diabetes and Peripheral Arterial Disease*, 2014

¹³ J. A. Mustapha, *Explaining Racial Disparities in Amputation Rates for the Treatment of Peripheral Artery Disease (PAD) Using Decomposition Methods*, J. Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities (2017) 4:784–795

Fibroid / Uterine Fibroid Embolization	Uterine fibroids are diagnosed roughly three times more frequently in Black women ¹⁴	Key Code (37243) Cut by 21%
--	---	-----------------------------

These ongoing cuts to specialties under the PFS also are weakening our healthcare system’s ability to deal with the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. A key lesson learned since the start of the pandemic is that it is critical that hospitals be able to focus on our sickest pandemic patients. Yet many other patients dealing with cancer, end-stage renal disease, coronary disease, and other post-acute issues cannot wait for the cancer care, dialysis vascular access repair, imaging, physical therapy, etc. that is critical to keeping them alive or out of the hospital.¹⁵¹⁶ Office-based care under the PFS provides a critical site-of-service outside of the hospital to deal with non-COVID cases so hospitals can focus on a resurging pandemic; ongoing cuts to PFS providers threaten the viability of the critical office-based setting during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁷

Considering that the second-order negative effects of PFS “budget neutrality” strongly outweigh incorporating new clinical labor data, **we strongly recommend CMS not finalize the clinical labor policy at this time in the 2022 PFS Final Rule.** Moreover, considering PFS “budget neutrality” effects from the 2021 PFS Final Rule E/M policy are still causing negative impacts in the form of a scheduled 3.75 percent cut to the conversion factor in 2022, **we urge you to work with Congress on fundamental reform to the PFS** in order that we may better address the upcoming 3.75 percent cut in legislation later this year.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

Bobby L. Rush
Member of Congress

Gus M. Bilirakis
Member of Congress

¹⁴ University of Michigan, *Understanding Racial Disparities for Women with Uterine Fibroids*, Beata Mostafavi, 12 August 2020

¹⁵ See, for example, the March 2020 CMS “Adult Elective Surgery and Procedures Recommendations,” which listed several “do not postpone” procedures such as most cancers, cardiac patients with symptoms, limb threatening vascular surgery, etc.

¹⁶ See also August 2020 CMS “Key Components for Continued COVID-19 Management for Dialysis Facilities,” which effectively lists dialysis vascular access as a “do not postpone” procedure.


¹⁷ Hospitals in two states where COVID-19 is surging already have begun to delay elective surgeries again. See Becker’s ASC Review, *Elective surgeries delayed at Florida, Louisiana hospitals amid COVID-19 surges*, 26 July 2021.



Peter A. DeFazio
Member of Congress




Fred Upton
Member of Congress



Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
Member of Congress



Sheila Jackson Lee
Member of Congress



Danny K. Davis
Member of Congress



Barbara Lee
Member of Congress



Ron Kind
Member of Congress




Steve Chabot
Member of Congress




Betty McCollum
Member of Congress



Stephen F. Lynch
Member of Congress




Michael C. Burgess, M.D.
Member of Congress



Henry Cuellar
Member of Congress



Steve Cohen
Member of Congress




Doug Lamborn
Member of Congress




Paul D. Tonko
Member of Congress



Ted Deutch
Member of Congress




Jeff Duncan
Member of Congress




Jaime Herrera Beutler
Member of Congress



Mike Kelly
Member of Congress




Billy Long
Member of Congress



David B. McKinley
Member of Congress



Frederica S. Wilson
Member of Congress



Donald M. Payne, Jr.
Member of Congress



Julia Brownley
Member of Congress



Tony Cárdenas
Member of Congress



Ann McLane Kuster
Member of Congress



Scott H. Peters
Member of Congress



Randy K. Weber, Sr.
Member of Congress




Alma S. Adams, Ph.D.
Member of Congress



Ed Case
Member of Congress



Earl L. "Buddy" Carter
Member of Congress



Tom Emmer
Member of Congress



John Katko
Member of Congress



Elise M. Stefanik
Member of Congress



David G. Valadao
Member of Congress




Neal P. Dunn, M.D.
Member of Congress




Brian Fitzpatrick
Member of Congress




Vicente Gonzalez
Member of Congress




Raja Krishnamoorthi
Member of Congress




Al Lawson, Jr.
Member of Congress



Jamie Raskin
Member of Congress



John R. Curtis
Member of Congress



Troy Balderson
Member of Congress



Joseph D. Morelle
Member of Congress



Colin Z. Allred
Member of Congress



Angie Craig
Member of Congress



Antonio Delgado
Member of Congress



Lizzie Fletcher
Member of Congress



Mark E. Green, MD
Member of Congress



Jim Hagedorn
Member of Congress



Dusty Johnson
Member of Congress



John Joyce
Member of Congress



Lucy McBath
Member of Congress



Daniel Meuser
Member of Congress



Tom O'Halleran
Member of Congress



Greg Pence
Member of Congress



Guy Reschenthaler
Member of Congress




Kim Schrier, M.D.
Member of Congress



W. Gregory Steube
Member of Congress



Fred Keller
Member of Congress



Gregory F. Murphy
Member of Congress



Randy Feenstra
Member of Congress



Andrew R. Garbarino
Member of Congress

/s/


Tony Gonzales
Member of Congress



Diana Harshbarger
Member of Congress



Young Kim
Member of Congress



Mariannette Miller-Meeks,
M.D.
Member of Congress



Marie Newman
Member of Congress



Deborah K. Ross
Member of Congress



Maria Elvira Salazar
Member of Congress



Beth Van Duyne
Member of Congress



Eleanor Holmes Norton
Member of Congress



Jennifer González-Colón
Member of Congress